



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/561,194

12/16/2005

Chan Wah Ng

L9289.05196

3919

52989

7590

10/29/2008

Dickinson Wright PLLC

James E. Ledbetter, Esq.

International Square

1875 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 1200

Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

CHAMBERS, TANGELA T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/561,194	Applicant(s) NG ET AL.	
	Examiner TANGELA T. CHAMBERS	Art Unit 2617	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nick Corsaro (SPE). (3) Tangela T. Chambers (Examiner).

(2) David Ward, Reg. No. 45,198. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 14 October 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: Slides regarding how claims 1 and 6 differed from prior art cited.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 6 and proposed new claim 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lee (Patent No. 6,535,493 B1) and Dutta (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0122976 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed features of claims 1 and 6 that are possibly not shown by the combination of Lee and Dutta. Arguments have weight regarding said claims concerning binding occurring at the apparatus instead of the system. Examiner will take a critical look at the arguments and references to determine if those limitations are shown in the references. A proposed new claim 7 and features of said claim was also discussed.

·

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Tangela T. Chambers/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617	
--	--